

Prejudice and Social Integration



SHOUT
SHARE **IT**

(iv) It is -ve orientation

(v) It is based on over generalisation

(vi) Once acquired cannot be easily removed

(vii) Has some relevance for the person who holds it

(viii) consists of stereotypes, pre-judgements & nasty judgements.

* Components of Prejudice

3 components

(i) Cognitive (ii) Affective (iii) Action Tendency

(i) Cognitive Component

↳ rigid beliefs } wrt target group (Prejudiced object)
↳ stereotypes

(ii) Affective Component

↳ -ve emotions } towards Target group
↳ irrational emotions

(iii) Action Tendency Component

possible beh. that one is likely to display towards Target group (PO)

• ~~B/A~~ Stereotypes are cognitive embodiment of prejudice

⇒ Prejudice → Over generalisation & faulty Abstraction.

* Ways of Prejudice Manifestation

(i) Antilocution

↳ speaking against someone
↳ spreading rumours
↳ locution → oratory

(ii) Avoidance

↳ purity - pollution

(iii) Discrimination

↳ Differential treatment to persons from a particular group.

• Discrimination can be done without prejudice → Indian govt.

• Prejudice can be there without discrimination → many times prejudices are held without their manifestation
(Also, situation or env. might not allow discrimination eg. if the people ~~who~~^{against} whom prejudices are held, are strong & cannot be discriminated)

(Discrimination is a way of manifestation of prejudice)

(iv) Physical Assault (one person)

(v) Extermination

↳ Holocaust, ethnic cleansing (whole community)

⇒ (These 5 given by Allport)

⇒ 2 more → a) Exploitation
b) Competition

* Development of Prejudice

(i) Societal Level Explanation

(ii) Individual " " — I (Psychoanalytical)

(iii) " " " — II (Socio-cultural)

(i) Societal Level Explanation

(1) Exploitation

(2) Realistic Group Conflict Theory

(1) Exploitation

- ↳ started by Karl Marx

↳ Then by Neo Marxists

Karl Marx $\rightarrow$ In every society $\rightarrow$ Haves $\rightarrow$ Resources
 $\rightarrow$ Have Nots $\rightarrow$ Lack Resources

- As long as Have Nots serve the Haves without demanding anything $\rightarrow$ structure of society is maintained.
- If Have Nots develop ability to demand resources, it will change the equation (due to political changes, etc.)

A simple hand-drawn smiley face with two vertical lines for eyes and a curved line for a mouth.

Conflicts & Prejudices

- Acc. to the theory → Prejudice is a -ve attitude that has been deliberately created by Haves to continue the exploitation of the Have Nots.

* Research done in Agra → Conflict bet. Jats & Jatavs
→ Jatavs → leather work

- Jats have kept the condition on Jatars that they will not carry their brides in palanquins.

⇒ After partition, many muslims left their leather work units → the Jats working there became owners.

⇒ This enabled the Jatars to defy the authority of Jats

⇒ Communal conflict started


- Acc. to Research → Muslims & Hindus of sleepy muslims don't fight
→ as they share poverty

- In Aligarh & Agra → Muslims built business
→ Fight over resources started

27-Mar-2019

(2) Realistic Group Conflict Theory

↳ Prejudice is the result of actual or perceived inter group relation



* +ve & -ve interdependence
 ↓ ↓
co-operation conflict

* For Nation building ⇒ +ve interdependence is required.


* -ve interdependence ⇒ Explains prejudice bet. 2 groups

(ii) Individual^{level} explanation (Psychoanalytical)

↳ scapegoating

↳ Projection

↳ Authoritarian Personality



⇒ Prejudice serves ego defensive function

⇒ Prejudice is caused because of anxiety (which cannot be reduced)

* Attitudes become prejudices when they are irreversible to change. (Allport) ⇒ This applies here

• Insecurity does not allow prejudices to go.


⇒ Those who champion the idea of removal of prejudice through education → Acc. to this theory it is not possible

⇒ Education just brings about intellectual change.

• Scapegoating

↳ This mechanism of prejudice dev. is based on:

- Hostility displacement (Freud)
- Frustration Aggression Hypothesis (Dollard & Miller)



- Scapegoat →
 - Disliked
 - visible
 - Approachable (easily)
 - Relatively powerless to retaliate

* The theory explains maintenance of prejudices properly but not formation of prejudices.

* Not always scapegoat is relatively powerless (not explained by this theory)

• Projection

↳ It is one of the features of scapegoating
↳ more comprehensive
↳ Repression

↳ person is not aware (the impulse is pushed into the unconscious)

eg. your actions make others to act and then you blame them

⇒ Different mechanisms can act together.

* Authoritarian Personality

(Adorno et al.)

⇒ Is there a prejudice personality ⇒ No

↳ There is no personality characteristic which can guarantee that prejudice will be there.

• As there is no terrorist or athlete personality (even if there are some common traits)

• Adorno et al

↳ some common characteristics of people who develop prejudice

a) Ethnocentric

↳ everything from the perspective of my culture

b) Unconscious conflicts

c) Anti-democratic

d) Low frustration tolerance

e) Rigid behavior & belief system

f) ~~g)~~

* The term prejudice personality can have many connotations.

1) A personality profile in people which is likely to turn them into prejudiced people.

2) People when they have become prejudiced, they acquire the traits shared by all prejudiced people

⇒ Prediction vs Postdiction

② is more common

⇒ Saying that ^{having} a common trait shared by most prejudiced people → probability is high but no guarantee can be given.

⇒ Adorno et al → Half Theory

→ only talked about child rearing

practices (authoritarian) only & he took only Freudian Approach.

→ Modeling, etc → The mechanisms not considered

eg. Common Trait of athletes → pain tolerance & better psycho-motor co-ordination

↓

But not all people with these traits will become athletes.

(iii) Individual Level Explanation - II (Socio-Cultural)

a) Socialization → a) Rewards & Punishment

b) Role playing

c) trial & error

etc.

Through family, school, peer group, etc.

b) Putting 2+2 together

↳ Inference drawing Hypothesis

eg. ^{Q1} Asking Father (white) → why is Johnny our servant (Black)

Father replies → His father was also our servant

Inference ⇒ Blacks are meant to be servant

• Attributional error & Selective Interpretation

Q2) Why Johnny does not go to school?

Father → I sent him to school but he did not study, dropped out.

(It was ignored that he was sent to evening school → He was tired ~~by~~ after household chores)

⇒ Inference drawn :- Blacks are meant to be servants

c) Belief Incongruence

↳ The belief that my belief system & your belief system ~~are~~^{are} different

(This is an assumption)

eg. Without reading a scripture → believing that the value systems of the religions are different.

d) Conformity

↳ Dissonance

↳ selective interpretation

↳ Attributional error

↳ " exposure

⇒ Pressure to conform → more pressure if the group is important to you.

Dissonance

eg. During apartheid time → ~~xx~~ keeping black servants at the shop

⇒ White people boycotted you

⇒ Dissonance as value to make profit is compromised.

⇒ One day a black tries to steal from your shop

↳ Label all blacks as cheats

↳ Remove them from your shop



Dissonance
Reduced

⇒ For most people, ways to reduce dissonance are the ones that strengthen prejudices.

⇒ Dissonance can reduce prejudices → only if no other ways of justification are used.

⇒ But people use change ~~at~~ with least effort and

strengthening of prejudices generally happens.

* Removal of Prejudices

• Freudian

* Symptomatic Theory Approach

Bring about Ego Maturity → by developing insight into repressed impulses.

(a) change CRPs

↳ Authoritarian → prejudices (lot of unconscious conflicts)

↳ Shift it to democratic

→ This is difficult as CRP is a personal affair. Also, a person who has been authoritarian ~~whole~~ whole life, will not change suddenly.

(b) Reducing conflict arousing aspects of their env.

↳ Dollard & Miller
(Economic Depression)

Research shows → Lynching of blacks in US increased during Economic Depression

→ Conflicts will not come only at the time of distress due to env. factor but also at the times of prosperity
↓
Relative Deprivation

(c) Psychotherapy

↳ If it is group psychotherapy

b) Clinical Interviews

c) Sensitivity Training

} found to be effective

d) Self Insight Training

↳ done by Katz et al

He took 2 groups

Grp I
(Insighted group)

Grp II
(Information group)

⇒ Made to read an essay, called
'Emotions & Attitude',

↳ described dynamics of
scapegoating, compensation
& projection in the development
of prejudice.

In Grp II → attempt was to correct their misinformation

In Grp I → help of case studies, explanations, real life
example

↓
How conflicts in the unconscious leads to
development of prejudices.

* Attitudes towards ethnic groups was measured:
↳ No change

~~After~~ After 6 months → Insighted group → significant
reduction in
prejudice

→ Misinformed group → no change

⇒ Removing misin-formation will not cause prejudices to go.

⇒ Why 6 weeks ⇒ Insight development takes time
(6 weeks were used for it)

⇒ Insight development helps in removal of prejudices.

⇒ When it came to ethnic prejudices → it worked
very well

" " " " family " → it did not
work

[No answer till now
for this]

Also, there was an appeal to have consistency bet. attitude & beh.

↳ This ^{appeal} can be the reason for change and not insight dev.

Q) Do you think ~~cathecting~~ ^{cothexis} will lead to prejudice reduction

Ans= No

↳ Bandura, ~~Alper~~ Skinner


eg. (pent up feelings)
↳ If energy is released by beating blacks, this beh. will be reinforced.

(when people ~~who~~ see violent things, they become violent)

29-March-2019


* Amelioration of Prejudice

Direct Approach
(Sociocultural approach)



Removal of Prejudice

→ Symptomatic (Freudian)
→ Direct (Socio-cultural Approach)



(All Humanistic & Freudian Approaches believe in development of insights)

Freud → Blocked out aspects of unconscious
→ Therapist is required

Humanist → Blocked out aspects of self
→ Patient himself

In socio-cultural Approach, prejudice removal will involve:

- Reattribution & Reappraisal
- Dissonance production & reduction
- Steps to reduce selective interpretation, perception, exposure & attention.
- Reinforcement

(a), (b) & (c) → cognitivist

(d) → behaviorist

* To enhance person's ZoA → so that counter-attitudinal msg. is thought upon & not rejected.

Q) Psychopathology of prejudice is small ~~but~~ story in explanation of prejudice but imp. in development of prejudice.

Ans = Disease model of prejudice → Freud

* Providing Info

(i) Education


(ii) Propaganda

Aim
• Increase Zone/Latitude of Acceptance of target group

⇒ We will consider knowledge function → ~~askes~~ less knowledge leads to prejudice.

* Changing the patterns of IGI & facilitating IGC

(Allport)
→ Contact Hypothesis → When person comes in contact with the object of prejudice
↓
he realises the baselessness of the stereotypes & prejudices



• we have to ensure that selective I, P, R, A do not come into play.

Conditions for the contact

- Prolonged
- Equal status
- Pleasant setting
- Voluntary

• As a result of contact:

(i) Prejudice removed (stereotype destruction)

(ii) Role interpretation
(stereotype pertaining to a role)

(iii) Consistency game

eg. Integrated Housing
(whites & Blacks living as neighbours)
(mere exposure effect)

(iv) Initially Dissonance is produced → This dissonance will be removed by changing the prejudice towards blacks.
(as beh. of black was found to be different than what you expected)

(v) Shared coping Approach

↳ Sherif et al

↳ Robber's cave experiment

⇒ & Categorisation → De categorisation → Re-categorisation

• Henri Tajfel → prejudice is inevitable
(it can be reduced but not removed)
→ Social Identity

⇒ Some evolutionary reason also → people who look like you appear less

⇒ You will have some anxiety in dealing with people who do not look like you.

* Social identity → join a group of people who are like minded.

→ For survival the group needs:

a) Cohesiveness

b) Its size should expand

(otherwise there is fear of losing to dominant group)

* In group → Ingroupism → attempt to dominate other outgroups
&
Ask people from other outgroups to join your group.

⇒ This is counter-productive for diverse society.

(Attributional error)

→ In group heterogeneity & out group homogeneity
(to continue prejudice)

* People from collectivist culture → more prone to prejudice

* Common Ingroup Identity Model → convince people that we all belong to the same group.
[Recategorisation]

(This failed in India)

⇒ It is far easier to condition a person to fear cockroach than a rabbit [we are biologically programmed for some responses]

* Sherif Etal Robber's cave experiment

22 boys → summer camp

⇒ same socio-economic status, educational level & locality

⇒ But they had never met each other

Stage 1

• 2 groups → 11 each (Eagles & Rattlers)

[These names will lead to self perception]

* They were given tasks that would require help from all 11 → eg. putting up a tent.

↳ Togetherness

⇒ The groups competed while putting up the tent.

⇒ Same activity led to competition

• Ingroup formation

↳ still not as much prejudice formation.

* football match → They were asked to win at all costs
(competitive env.)

• Inter group competition → Inter group hostility

Now, To remove hostility → Inter group contact

• Both the groups brought together for lunch and they were monitored (so that no one misbehaves)

⇒ They were told → huge reward awaits you, if you can win tug of war against a truck (loaded)

* First, only 11 of group tried

↳ They both tried & failed (only 11)

* They all came together & moved the truck.

- Shared coping
- Super ordinate goal




eg. people of different religions on a life boat & shark is in the water.

⇒ They all want to achieve the goal but cannot achieve it individually → They have to co-operate.

⇒ This is a reason as why wars brings people ^{together} ~~together~~.

* Shared coping ⇒ removal of prejudice.

(That cave was used by robbers to hide ^{once} and hence was called Robber's cave)



• Intensification → If I take you as a friend & we have to work for a common goal, hence the unlearning of stereotypes in intensified

• Friendship → Person with whom we work together for a common goal is a friend & having a friend too

is difficult.

* Intergroup Conflict

It has been defined as perceived incompatibility of interests. Conflicts inevitably arise out of clashes of values, attitudes &/or beh. Conflicts may occur when persons or group hold competitive interests. Conflicts therefore are the result of disagreement over social issues, beliefs, ideologies or specific behaviors that occur when the parties have divergent interest concerning the same issue.

* Factors influencing conflict

(i) Power differential

(Haves vs Have Nots)

If Have Nots $\rightarrow$ ^{get} education $\rightarrow$ challenge $\rightarrow$ conflict
Haves

(ii) Competition

- Non-zero sum game $\rightarrow$ one side winning does not mean other side losing.
- Zero sum game $\rightarrow$ one side winning means other side losing.
eg. Football match in Robber's cave experiment
- Zero sum game $\rightarrow$ I gain at your expense $\rightarrow$ Conflict
- $\Rightarrow$ Short term personal gain is chosen over long term collective gain & hence conflict.
- $\Rightarrow$ Competition $\rightarrow$ major reason for ~~can~~ conflict

(iii) Relative deprivation

$\hookrightarrow$ Fraternal $\rightarrow$ group (You feel your group has been deprived)

$\hookrightarrow$ Egoistic $\rightarrow$ Individual (You feel you have been deprived) 70%

- a) Wanting } They ^{lead} ~~make~~ relative deprivation to a conflict
b) Deserving }

⇒ Relative Dep. can work on the side ⇒ Work for the improvement of your group rather than harming other groups.

(iv) Conflicting Aspirations

eg. Kashmir conflict

↳ People are not able to appreciate the viewpoint of others → conflict becomes inevitable

(v) Ambiguity over Jurisdiction & responsibility

eg. Kashmir conflict

(vi) Misperception & faulty Attributions

↳ ^{by} White → factors

(a) Virile self image (masculine)

(b) Diabolical enemy image

↳ consider other person as dubious

(c) Absence of empathy

(d) Moral self Image

↳ you think that your position is right
(God is on our side)

(e) Delegitimation

↳ Dehumanisation

↳ Trait characterisation

eg. Security forces (SF) ↔ Terrorist Group (TG)

SF have to take action against TG, to stop their conscience → delegitimation is done

→ They are told that TG is outside the norms

↓
Carry violent Action

(f) Military over confidence

(vii) Just World Hypothesis

↳ a typical attribution error

(viii) Presence of distrust bet. the groups

• Indian Context

Factors

- (i) Presence of ideologies that condone rather than condemn violence.
- (ii) Fear of limited resources.
- (iii) Low legitimacy of state institutions.
- (iv) Easy availability of firearms
- (v) Presence of role models (aggressive)
- (vi) Poor grievance redressal system
- (vii) Factor that create parochial ~~outlook~~ ^{narrow outlook} mindset
such as (a) widespread casteism
(b) politicisation of caste, religion, etc
- (viii) Educational & Economic backwardness

30-Mar-2019

* How to reduce intergroup conflict

(i) Power Restoration

↳ through affirmative action
eg. Reservation

⇒ -ve : -a) People provided PR will have less motivation to work hard

b) It ~~can~~ ^{can} increase prejudice

(1) Tokenism

(2) Reverse Discrimination

8) In India, it leads to class formation within a caste.

* Tokenism → Affirmative actions will give reasons to other groups to strengthen their ~~pre~~ prejudices towards the group ~~for~~.

* Reverse Discrimination → eg. Teacher of high caste gives more marks to students of lower castes as:

(a) they will not trouble him ~~reg~~ saying that less marks have been given (contact with them is avoided)

(b) In the actual exam, they will not do well (because of inflated scores given by the teacher, they had inflated sense of their ability)

⇒ These are covert ways

(ii) Creation of super ordinate goals

↳ Recategorisation
eg. Sherif's exp.

(iii) opening up the channels of communication

Recategorisation → Rehab. of Aids patients
→ Juvenile Delinquency
→ Alcohol Addicts

→ Theory of planned beh. (for alcoholism)

→ Intra personal conflicts → inter personal conflicts

(iv) understanding the aspirations of the other party

↳ openness
↳ Agreeableness } ⇒ generation of integrative solution (IS)

709

→ Blending the aspirations of both the parties

→ win-win game

→ In compromise → both the parties settle for something less than what they expected
→ participation of both parties will not be equal.



Difference from Integrative solution

⇒ Compromise is a type of Integrative solution finding.

* Integrative solution finding is the most desirable method of conflict resolution since the aspiration of both the parties are reconciled & blended to produce the result that integrate the needs of both the side & produced joint benefits. In some cases, it is possible to reach completely Integrated Solutions wherein aspirations of both the sides are more or less completely met. But in most other cases, only partially integrated solutions can be reached which is similar to compromise.

Integrative solutions are the best because:

a) The benefit both the sides

b) Mutually agreed upon

c) strengthen feeling of co-operation as joint effort is needed to produce them

d) They tend to be more stable

(v) GRIT (Graduated & Reciprocal Initiatives in Tension Reduction)

↳ based on reciprocity

eg. Nuclear disarmament by 2 countries

(vi) Negotiations

↳ ~~if~~ they involve use of dialogue & giving up their positions (best if Integrated solution is reached)

(vii) Third Party Intervention

↳ It is not welcome → when no trust in third party
↳ not always, people need a 3rd party, they want to solve the problem face to face.

Q) Is it correct to say that conflicts are always bad?
(Not always conflict is bad)
Ans = Freudian

Conflict can remove stagnation from life, it can force you to find new ways.

Pos

a) Conflict avoids stagnation & stimulates interest & curiosity.

b) It is a medium through which problems can be aired & solutions can be arrived.

c) External conflict to some extent fosters internal cohesiveness.

d) Conflict is the part of testing & assessing oneself & therefore can be highly enjoyable exercise for those who want the full use of their capacity.

e) Conflict can help to demarcate the groups from one another & thus establish group & personal identities.

* 3 imp. terms

(i) Deindividuation

↳ Any individual who is perpetrating violence has a feeling that he or she is somehow anonymous and therefore, no shame can be attached to ~~his~~ them.

(ii) Dehumanisation

↳ It refers to a belief that the human beings that are being killed or injured are not humans at all but in fact are the units of enemy's fighting force that need to be eliminated.

eg. (Lynching) → seeing a police personnel as ^{something which is all present whose} obstruction in reaching their goal.

iii) Disinhibition

(Bandura)

↳ Reduction in psychosocial forces within the individual that prevents him from acting in a controlled manner.

- Mob → active group of people having lot of energy
→ Diffusion & Displacement of responsibility

- Mob Control → a) Make rapport with some people & tell them that they can still be recognised in the crowd.

b) Obstruct the movement → all the energy is employed in removing the barrier.

→ Place the barrier in such a way that it stops the flow

→ patience & tolerance (required)

* Why humanitarian classroom fails?

Ans: a) Moral Disengagement → selectively decide on the morals

(students)
→ They can be moral when they want

b) Students have poor self control

* Important Points

(can be used in all answers)

- (i) Priming
- (ii) Transfer of control
- (iii) Desensitisation
- (iv) Deindividualisation
- (v) Dissonance Arousal
- (vi) Narcissistic Rage
- (vii) Disinhibition
- (viii) Moral Disengagement
- (ix) Displacement
- (x) Faulty Appraisal
- (xi) Misattribution
- (xii) Trait Characterisation
- (xiii) Illusion of Invulnerability

Social Integration

It refers to psychological & emotional integration of various groups in a society. SI is said to have been achieved when various social groups while retaining with their respective identities are able to also align with common identity that binds various groups together. To achieve SI, it is essential that the various social groups making up the society, are able to develop.

- (a) common attitude, aspirations & belief systems.
- (b) common goals & mutually agreed upon manner of pursuing these goals.

SI can be viewed as social, psychological & educational process through which a feeling of unity, solidarity & cohesion develops among different social groups in a given society. It is the process of creating common bond & along with it feeling of brotherhood.

Many experts view SI as a 2-fold process of administrative & political integration on one hand & the psychological integration on the other hand. The latter is more imp. & difficult to achieve and it consists of 3 components.

- (i) Cognitive component (similar belief systems)
- (ii) Affective component (similar emotions generated)
- (iii) Behavioral component (similar type of action is demonstrated when certain stimuli is presented.)